

*Architects*, a city plan influenced by the Baroque concept of Versailles really was "an assertion of a bold new republic in a barely touched wilderness," today it seems more nearly like some nineteenth-century millionaire's castle transported brick by brick from its European setting to an esthetically uncertain America.

Worse, if the "plan" of the federal city has been distorted by growth and in its turn has distorted growth, then beyond the limits of L'Enfant's sketch maps there is little but helter-skelter. Far into the Virginia and Maryland countryside sprawl the suburbs, some tight and lovely like Kenwood with its cherry trees, most flung down with a builder's giant careless hand on treeless plains that were formerly forests, some waiting hideously to become official slums. The freeway builders, frantically flinging as much traffic as possible into Washington's already strangling thoroughfares, are at once behind in their work and agitating for the privilege of pouring concrete over everything. Rapid transit does not exist, although a limited subway system soon will be under construction; some federal workers who live in far-out suburbs actually arrive in their parking lots at 5 and 6 o'clock in the morning to avoid rush-hour traffic, then sleep behind the wheel until time to punch the clock. What they suffer on the way home is ghastly to contemplate, especially in the special torture Washington reserves for creeping motorists—August.

East of 16th Street, whole areas are entirely populated by Negroes living in the poverty and slum conditions they have endured so long in other cities. Many of them can see the Capitol dome from the littered alleys and cluttered sidewalks and bare, sun-baked porches that are their escape from the tenements; it can hardly be an inspiring view.

Washington is famous for crime and rape and muggers—although I know of no statistics which prove it the worst in this regard, or even an unsafe city. The fact that it has a majority of Negroes, and its hierarchy of Southern politicians, combine to foster the myth that black men make this a terrified place. But there is no part of Washington so sullen as the Watts district of Los Angeles or Oakland's Negro ghetto, so seething as New York's Harlem, or more dangerous than its Central Park.

The petty bureaucracy of what is laughingly called the District of Columbia government is inefficient, impervious, and immovable. Congress is responsible, in many ways, for inadequate school budgets, shocking welfare payments and institutions, and low prices at the whiskey stores (you can buy better wines more cheaply in Washington than in any city I know—a poor consolation). Nobody has the right to vote anybody out of office, much less in, and there is so much slow, sloppy, and untimely street construction and repair that the old saying perfectly fits: "It'll be a great city if they ever get it finished." Old landmarks go under here as they do elsewhere—the house where Woodrow Wilson married Mrs. Galt got the wrecking ball a year or so ago, and only the Kennedys saved part of Lafayette Square opposite the White House from becoming a concrete canyon; two sides of Farragut Square have been completely rebuilt while I have watched from my office window, and what they have done to Capitol Hill in a decade ought to be a federal crime.

In the summer the Potomac is apt to smell, and any time, as Bobby Kennedy said of New York's East River, if you fall in, you don't drown; you dissolve. In winter the streets are either glassy or slushy and snow removal is hopeless. When I lived on R Street, hard-packed snow stayed on the pavement for six weeks after the Kennedy Inaugural blizzard.

But all of this is not really the Washing-

ton I first saw that brilliant morning thirty years ago when I came out of Union Station to the edge of the great plaza, holding my father's hand, and stood stricken in the giddy light, dumb with wonder and belief.

This is not merely because the surface of the city is so much altered from the miracle place of my boyhood. The trolleys are gone now, and I don't suppose tourist families stay in rooming houses on Capitol Hill any more. The Smithsonian has a massive new building. John Kennedy lies at Arlington with the Unknown Soldier. They have restored Ford's Theatre to look like a theater, and everyone drives down to Mount Vernon on a four-lane highway. There is a cheap new façade on the Capitol, and Harry Truman put a balcony on the White House; Mrs. Kennedy filled its public rooms with antiques, and Lyndon Johnson filled its private offices with Dallas modern and piped-in Muzak. Union Station is cavernous and gloomy now, and the last time I was there the fountain where the children played was dry and full of dead leaves. Jimmy Hoffa's marble temple for the Teamsters' Union stands along the plaza where one of those elegant hotels did, and the rest of them are no longer elegant, if they ever were. Now the great entrance to the city—the most beautiful entrance in the world, I think—is the long ride in from Dulles International Airport, along the Potomac on the George Washington Parkway, with the spires of Georgetown University rising across the river and the Washington Monument shining in the distance.

That is not, of course, real change, and neither is the relatively new Jefferson Memorial on the Tidal Basin or the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge or even the monstrously ugly third House Office Building. (There always has been a touch of the grotesque about Washington—the old Smithsonian, for instance—and perhaps in time even this crouching eyesore on Capitol Hill will seem, like others, at home in the city.) No, the essential Washington is just what it was thirty years ago, and more, having survived architects, engineers, politicians, bureaucrats, demonstrators, and urban planners. It is just what it was because Americans still weep in the Lincoln Memorial and small boys still stand in awe in front of George Washington's tomb and troop happily through the old cars at the Smithsonian and dream their secret dreams at the FBI and burst with pride when they first see the nation's Capitol. Parents still bring their children here and show them the Declaration of Independence under glass and listen to the tour guide's spiel in front of the Supreme Court and take pictures of the statue of Albert Gallatin in front of the Treasury.

Perhaps few of them know who Gallatin was, or care, but the meanness of them know he was part of something, and they are part of it, too. I have seen fat women in ridiculously tight shorts walking carefully around Statuary Hall in the Capitol, peering closely at banal bronze figures of men so obscure even historians would have to look them up, and high school kids wearing Confederate caps and popping gum line up for blocks to take a quick walk through the White House. They are part of the same thing: secret sharers, bearers of a seed.

But not merely sharers of the showplace, the museum, the history lesson. Behind those facades, those bronze doors, down this echoing corridor, the collective work of a people is in progress. The President really is at his desk in that great house on Pennsylvania Avenue, making his way like the rest of us, enduring his trials, doing his best. Those men down there on the floor of the Senate and the House, those small posturers glimpsed from the crowded galleries, really are representing us, really are trying to make our case, whatever it is. And there behind the great stone faces of the Commerce De-

partment and the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission and the Pentagon and the State Department our business is going forward, or maybe backward, but going somewhere, getting done. We are at the heart of the matter here. Washington's business is the people's business, for better or for worse.

That is what Washington really is and what we all share—the place where the past has produced this present, and this present will go on to whatever future, carrying us all with it, influenced by each of us as we must be by it. It is what we have made of things, and shall make. It is where America lives—all of us in spirit if only a few in fact, in our vigor and our dreams, our carelessness and haste, our glory and our burden, our borrowed finery from another world that gave us birth, our native grace, our coarse pretension. It is all here—what we remember, what we hope; what we are and what we ought to be—in this city of the strong but chastened heart.

I did not know, that morning all those years ago, that carved above me in the patient stone of Union Station I could find the truth about Washington:

"He who would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him."

I did not know the words, but I found that truth anyway. Americans must bring Washington here in their hearts, if they would carry it with them when they go.

#### WILDCAT STRIKE IN STEEL HAUL INDUSTRY DEPLORED

Mr. MORSE, Mr. President, Teamster General Vice President Frank E. Fitzsimmons today deplored the violence and irresponsibility of wildcat strikers in the steel haul industry.

Fitzsimmons made the International Brotherhood of Teamsters' position clear in a statement today to both Labor Committees of Congress. Fitzsimmons said:

This is a wildcat strike. It is not sanctioned by the International Union. These people have an agreement, which is a supplement to our Master National Freight Agreement. It was properly put before the 450,000 members covered under the agreement and overwhelmingly ratified. The vote, a mail referendum, was supervised by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Neither do we condone the violence which has accompanied this wildcat strike, and we are somewhat amazed that state officials have let the violence continue—

Fitzsimmons said.

We have held meetings with these people trying to determine their grievances, if any exist. These meetings have been unsuccessful.

Both the union and management take the position that these workers have a signed contract which has proper machinery for the processing of grievances. The Union has consistently tried to get these people to use this grievance machinery, and has consistently and still urges them to return to work. Doing this, we will be able to air the grievances in concert with the terms of the agreement—

Fitzsimmons said.

The International Union stands ready and willing to assist when the parties to this wildcat action indicate a responsible approach to the problem. In the meantime, we take the position that it is a wildcat strike, it is not sanctioned by the International Union, and are quite in accord with the sentiment that the violence must be stopped—

Fitzsimmons declared.

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I received word that the President signed Senate Joint Resolution 109 today. This was the joint resolution introduced by me, with Senator WILLIAM SPONG as co-sponsor, setting aside the first week in October to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Langley Research Center. It is a fitting tribute to an installation that has contributed for 50 years to American advancement in aeronautical and space research.

I spent Monday morning touring the facilities and exhibits at Langley Research Center at Hampton, Va. I have seldom spent a more enlightening and informative morning.

This week, through Friday, the personnel of Langley will be happy and proud to show everyone through the facilities. Were it not for the press of business in the Senate, I would urge all Senators to take advantage of this opportunity to witness firsthand the advancements that are being made at this vital research center.

## THE THRUST OF OUR VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, as the presidential election campaign approaches, the great Vietnam debate grows more persistent, more passionate, and, unfortunately, more political. Twelve months ago it was not this way. Then, too, there were disagreements with the administration's Vietnam policies. Then they were more in the nature of scholarly efforts to evaluate different courses of action. The change has not been altogether subtle. Now much of the criticism has become politically motivated. It is based on whatever advantage may be gained by appealing to an apparent antiadministration attitude on the part of the general public. Both Democrats and Republicans are busy releasing position papers to the news media. They hurry to put their own plans for peace before the television cameras. In some of this, there is cynical disregard for the tremendous responsibility involved in the ultimate choice of national policy.

Many of the proposals are based on the delightful but unrealistic theory that "faith, hope, and charity" abound in the world; that wishful thinking will somehow affect the actions of Hanoi and Peking. Others subscribe to the "eye-for-an-eye" or "might makes right" principle, by which peace may be realized only through complete and overwhelming military victory. Attractive as these proposals may be, at the moment and on the surface—each to some segment of American public opinion—none of them bears up under careful examination in the light of what is best for the future security of the United States.

The thrust of our Vietnam policy must be maintained far above the reach of politically motivated consideration. It must be based on lessons learned from recent history. It must be influenced by hardheaded understanding of the Communist doctrines of expansion and aggression. In sustaining a policy based on

these factors, President Johnson is much too experienced a politician not to appreciate the resulting political disadvantage. Nevertheless, while riddled by the sniping of politically motivated criticism, the President has remained firm.

This resolve has not gone altogether unnoticed in the press. A recent editorial in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle gave an objective analysis of the President's problems. It cleared away a considerable amount of political fog and penetrated to the heart of the issue. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Johnson Still Gets Our Vote," published in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## JOHNSON STILL GETS OUR VOTE

President Johnson's popularity in the polls is slipping because of his Vietnam policies and because some voters believe that the Johnson administration and the Democrats, generally, have a soft-line policy on Negroes.

The President is vulnerable in both areas as witness the defection amongst the governors and leaders in his own party.

Many believe that he cannot win reelection, even if Nixon is the Republicans' candidate.

Governor Romney of Michigan says he's been brainwashed by the administration on Vietnam. He is now counted out of the GOP race as a man with demonstrable shortcomings.

Governor Rockefeller says that, unless some new course of action is taken, this country will have civil war in the cities.

Rockefeller declines candidacy, but is far and away the ablest man the Republicans can field.

Senator Percy is now being pushed by Senator Dirksen and others as the new moderate Republican candidate for President to replace Romney, who has been cashiered.

Percy declines the candidacy publicly, but is making pronouncements on Vietnam, such as the most recent, stating that the President is lying to the American people.

Strong words, we think, for a man with no experience in international affairs and a very junior senator from Illinois.

Our posture in Vietnam was inherited by President Johnson. He had, of course, at that time, the option to reverse things, but he did not do so.

Since then the situation has worsened and the war has been accelerated to the degree that no one could have forecast—except the Vietnamese—two or three years ago.

President Johnson has been resolute and firm in the execution of his Vietnamese policy.

This he has done in the face of continuing losses in popularity with the voters and, of course, with the politicians in his own party, many of whom need coat-tails.

In addition to this, much of the press has become hostile and more recently, a misguided, however sincere, couple returned to the President a posthumous award sent to them from the White House.

This was the President's war, they said, and their son need not have perished.

Even presidents get hit below the belt.

Governor Romney, a states' righter of the first water, is, however, the first to run to Washington for military assistance in Detroit rioting last summer.

He is fighting yet with the President about this and no one is really sure which run of the argument to accept, save that the President is being blamed for slow response to Michigan for "political reasons," thereby allowing the riots to spread.

We are not sold on the Administration's

position in Vietnam, but it is a position that has been taken by President Johnson and a position that has been maintained without wavering since its outset.

To a great degree our Vietnam situation is a national commitment, beyond anything but academic debate.

We are there.

Men have been and are giving of their lives for the commitment.

President Johnson's high purpose and resolution in Vietnam seems to have escaped many Americans.

While he continues to take a pounding on all sides, even more praise-worthy is his restraint in dignifying some of the criticisms with a response.

The President is unpopular at a time when the country enjoys the greatest prosperity any nation in the world has ever known; but he gets no credit for this; only blame for what is not going well.

This newspaper supported President Johnson for the presidency in 1964 with some reservations, but as the only sensible choice.

Many supported and voted for Johnson as "the lesser of two evils."

Some supposed that the man really lacked the moral character and fibres to be anything more than the "wheeler-dealer" politician.

We believe time has shown that there is more to Lyndon Johnson.

Johnson has demonstrated some characteristics in office that confound and belie the Johnson saga.

In Vietnam he may be dead right, or dead wrong.

Who is really to say?

But he has set a course of policy and has had the courage and determination to adhere to it, despite loss of popularity and personal abuse.

It is said that the President would lose an election today, but there isn't one Republican candidate yet on the horizon whom we'd support.

Lyndon Johnson still gets our vote.

## THE ABM ILLUSION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin Diamond, senior editor of Newsweek magazine, has written a devastating analysis of the illusory notion that we are buying security by constructing a costly anti-ballistic-missile system. This perceptive analysis appears in the October 2, 1967, issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE GRAND ILLUSION

(By Edwin Diamond)

Secretary McNamara's decision to go ahead with an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system is based on a set of brilliantly reasoned, highly sophisticated, and strongly persuasive arguments. But the decision is wrong, and the consequences of this error will burden every American for years to come.

Instead of strengthening the national security, the ABM decision may well undermine it, for it upsets the present delicate balance of nuclear terror based on the twin implicit assumptions of a strong (four-to-one) but not overwhelming U.S. offensive missile superiority and a modest Soviet defensive advantage. Worse, the ABM move signals another dangerous upward spiral in the nuclear-arms race which may lead to a renewed drive by both the U.S. and Soviet Union to add new offensive weapons to the overkill arsenal each already possesses. Roswell L. Gilpatric, McNamara's own former Deputy Defense Secretary, fears the ABM means a U.S. global strategy based more on

October 4, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

conflict than accommodation. The go-ahead, he said, "is certainly a move in the wrong direction."

Let's put these abstractions in concrete terms—and concrete is exactly where we are now heading. At the very least, this new nuclear escalation means the expenditure of untold billions in exchange for a wholly illusory security blanket. Whether the U.S. spends \$4 to \$5 billion for the "thin" ABM system to guard its Minuteman strike force, or \$40 billion for the "thickening" of the blanket to protect major American cities, or \$400 billion to protect smaller cities, the end result will be the same: all of us will still be 30 minutes away from nuclear annihilation.

## MOLE SOCIETY

Indeed, with the ABM escalation, the possibility of this supposedly "unthinkable" missile Armageddon is greater, not smaller. All of us have now been propelled by the logic of nuclear events that McNamara grasps so well toward the next era of the atomic age—the mole society where the cities and civilians of the 1980's may have to burrow underground to join the concrete Minuteman silos sunk in the 1960s and the subterranean ABM control centers built in the 1970s.

Unlikely, you will say; right out of some science-fiction paperback. But who would have believed, ten years ago, at the time of Sputnik 1 and the "missile gap," that the U.S. within five years would possess the nuclear missiles to destroy the Soviet society and population five times over?

What evidence have I that McNamara—one of the most brilliant and dedicated minds in the nation—is wrong about the ABM? What proof is there that the U.S. has embarked on a dangerous new course? The evidence is abundant. Precisely because McNamara has such a firm grasp of the complexities of the age, he himself has supplied some of the best arguments against the ABM and a new arms race. In fact, if an analyst were to overlay McNamara's speech with one of the cryptologist's sheets that cover some paragraphs while revealing others, the case for the present stabilized strategic situation would become compelling.

## "ACTION-REACTION"

First of all, as McNamara makes clear, the U.S. now has "a numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate and effective warheads [that] is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require." This, to use the blunt term, is what overkill means. And overkill, to be blunt again, is the legacy of politically motivated "missile-gap" cries of the late 1950s. The panic button was pushed in the U.S. and a real missile gap did eventually materialize. But as McNamara points out in his speech, this gap favors the U.S. At present the U.S. has 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons in readiness against 700 for the U.S.S.R. The Russian response to this U.S. superiority has been to concede an offensive disparity. In effect the Soviet Union acknowledged that the richness and ingenuity of American technology could not be matched. But it began an ABM system—the Russian military has been traditionally defense minded—as part of what McNamara calls the "action-reaction" of the arms race.

McNamara has been conspicuously unworried by this deployment. As he explains it, the offense always has an advantage over the defense and any ABM system "can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending over more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

The logic of the situation calls for one of the superpowers to forego the next turn in the vicious cycle of action-reaction. A Soviet McNamara—they have their sophisticated strategists and their war gamesmen,

too—might argue that the Soviet ABM deployment represented a limited and measured response to U.S. superiority, a move intended to assure Russian second-strike capability and thus make the Soviet deterrent credible. Why not leave the arms race in this trade-off situation? Why upset the fearfully delicate balance of terror with a U.S. ABM system?

McNamara's answer last week was: because of the looming Chinese nuclear-missile threat of the 1970's. The proposed U.S. ABM system, in McNamara's words, is "Chinese-oriented," designed to deter Chairman Mao or his successors from an attack on the U.S. It is at this point that McNamara's computer logic breaks down.

## MAD ADVENTURE

First, if Peking is suicidally mad enough to mount an attack on a country possessing 200 times more nuclear power than it has, then no amount of objective reality in the form of an American ABM barrier can dissuade the Chinese from their insanity. If the Chinese are bent on nuclear genocide, they could smuggle an atomic bomb into San Francisco harbor aboard a freighter and detonate it. No ABM system can protect against such mad adventures.

Second, the Soviet Union can also argue that its ABM is "Chinese-oriented," and merely a matter of insurance against an irrational attack by a country that shares an uneasy border with Russia and is violently hostile to it. After all, the same madness that might lead the Chinese to attack the U.S. might also push Mao over the brink with the Russians. Would we believe the Russians if they said, "It's the Chinese we are worried about—ignore our ABM"? Yet we expect them to believe our ABM is China-oriented.

The truth is the ABM decision was dictated not by strategy but by politics. Computer logic breaks down because men aren't computers; they are imperfect beings shaped by history and emotion as well as reason. There are really two McNamaras. One McNamara coolly attempts to manage the arms race by force of argument and intellect. He even on occasion does the Russian's thinking for them, patiently elucidating the nuclear strategic options available and their consequences in speeches and in briefings held for the press, but aimed at Moscow. The second McNamara is an American, a patriot and a member of the Johnson Administration (just as his opposite in the Kremlin is a Russian, a patriot, and a member of the Communist Party).

It is well known in Washington that Secretary McNamara for months has opposed deployment of the ABM system despite the urgings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of Democratic hawks and of Republicans sensing a hot campaign issue for 1968. As James Reston suggested last week, the ABM system launched by McNamara is not aimed at blocking the Chinese or even the Russians, but the Republicans. By acceding now to the clamor, McNamara has blunted the GOP charge that he is "indifferent" to the defense of the American people.

## GOOD GUYS

Yet, isn't the U.S. asking—a bit illogically—the Soviet McNamara to be indifferent to the defense of his people? More fundamentally, isn't the U.S. saying—also a bit illogically—that when it comes to the crunch, two standards apply: we are the good guys and would never attack first; you are the bad guys and you might attack first, and that is why we must have a four-to-one offensive superiority and defensive parity (at least)—and a lead in whatever else we decide to build.

Last week was the time for patience and courage—patience to lecture the Russians once again on the reasons behind the eminently equitable U.S. plan to put a freeze on all missiles, offensive and defensive; courage,

in the words of former Kennedy science adviser Jerome Wiesner, to run the risks of deescalation instead of the risks of new escalation; and patience and courage to explain to the American people, even in a pre-election year, why the ABM is not good for their security.

Instead, Washington gave us the ABM. By some curious alchemy, the Administration has convinced itself that the thin ABM system doesn't really change the balance of terror: only a thick system would do that. But thin leads to thick. It is all like that celebrated biology experiment: a frog is placed in a tank of water; daily the temperature is increased one degree; the frog exists as always—until one more degree . . . the water boils . . . the frog dies.

## A SMALL BUSINESS IS SAVED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a business employing 75 persons in three different plants is a very substantial enterprise in North Dakota. Those interested in promoting the economic well-being of the State and its citizens became justifiably alarmed when, in 1963, such a firm appeared to be reaching the end of its life cycle.

The company was highly regarded, having been in business for almost 60 years. The firm had a healthy backlog of unfilled sales orders but working capital had been devastated by excessive growth of inventory and accounts receivable.

On a May morning in 1963, the company's shareholders petitioned a North Dakota court to appoint a receiver to reorganize the company. The court complied, appointing as receiver a North Dakota businessman with a growing reputation for saving insolvent companies, Mr. Richard Barry, of Fargo.

Within a year after petitioning the court, the company was reestablished on a sound, profitable basis. What had occurred in the intervening months was a testimonial to what can be achieved by smooth-functioning cooperation among business, labor, and Government.

The patient forbearance of creditors was rewarded by full payment of their claims against the company. Funds for repayment came from the proceeds of a Small Business Administration loan. Careful analysis of the company's financial records and outlook had convinced SBA officials of the firm's basic soundness. Sensing the importance of quick action, the SBA expeditiously approved a \$225,000 loan to the reorganizing firm.

During the time the company was in receivership, the employees, with the concurrence of their Teamster Union officers, agreed to reductions of about \$1,000 per month in certain fringe benefits to which they were otherwise entitled under their union contract with the company. Unless the company's working capital had been relieved of this burden it is doubtful the company could have survived this critical period.

Today this company remains an important contributor to the economy of North Dakota. Without the enlightened cooperation of the receiver, the employees and their union, creditors, and the Small Business Administration, the company would merely have become an addition to our business failure statistics.

## HARD-CORE POVERTY PROBLEMS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, many programs have been pursued by our Government in its efforts to resolve the hard-core poverty problems of our cities and our rural areas.

There have been successes and there have been mistakes. There have even been a few failures. But there is no doubt in my mind that our efforts have been serious and reflect a genuine concern for the disadvantaged of our Nation.

One of the key attacks on poverty has revolved around the question of providing meaningful jobs for those who have not been able to obtain them—and of training those who are not qualified so they can become employable. In this respect, such concentrated employment programs as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, on-the-job training, and institutional training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and new careers and special impact have resulted in thousands of jobs for disadvantaged persons in our society who held little hope for employment before.

But if there has been any one thing which has made it difficult to step up our efforts, perhaps it has been the multiplicity and complexity of programs and the intricate network of agencies and bureaus which often confront those who wish to help with discouraging confusion.

Mr. President, President Johnson has just announced a new Government-wide pilot program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands more of America's hard-core unemployed. As I understand the President's proposals, this new program will go far toward cutting through the redtape which has sometimes delayed and even prevented the flow of action needed to move forward with this much-needed task.

The President's new program aims at providing one-stop service for interested businessmen and coordinates effort by the five Cabinet-level departments and three independent agencies which have principal responsibility in this vital field of jobs and training.

Using some \$40 million of funds already available, the initial efforts of the coordinated program will be applied to the slum or ghetto areas of five cities and two or three rural poverty areas.

I am particularly pleased to note that our Nation's Capital has been selected as one of these pilot cities. There is not only a real need for this approach to our problems in the District, but, by example, the seat of our National Government should provide leadership to the rest of the Nation in solving our serious urban problems.

Any of us who thinks that this country does not have such problems and a responsibility to solve them has but to look back over the past summer months at the riots which took a tragic toll in lives and cost us millions in property losses.

I am convinced that business and industry shares with us the acute awareness that solutions must be found, and found quickly, to the root causes of these

devastating upheavals. It is not only a matter on our collective conscience, it is a matter of economic survival.

The President's new approach deserves our earnest support. It can put the Federal Government and private industry into a new partnership which may very well be the saving of our cities and, indeed, our society. At the very least, it can develop new and quicker avenues of communication, can open up the intricate paths of bureaucracy to something more like an expressway for those who want to help take action.

Surplus Federal property and equipment will be used, present training and job programs will be focused, risks such as vandalism—which have kept business and industry away from the ghetto—will be insured to encourage development of employment where it is sorely needed, in the heart of the problem.

Mr. President, I commend the President for these new proposals and urge Senators to join with me in seriously considering and supporting this new and significant effort.

#### SENATOR PROUTY ADDRESSES OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last week the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] took time out from debating the poverty bill to address 100 members of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce who were in Washington on a study tour.

The topic of the Senator's speech was the Human Investment Act approach to the unemployment and underemployment problems of our Nation. This subject has great relevance today because of our concern over the problems of poverty and our search for solutions to them. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator PROUTY's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am delighted to have this opportunity to talk to you today. It is always a pleasure to be able to address high-minded and knowledgeable groups who take time out to familiarize themselves with the legislative process, and crucial issues of the time. Perhaps after this trip to Washington, you can return home and make some contributions of your own by educating fellow citizens and by vocalizing your own views.

Incidentally, I imagine that many of you are also members of the National Federation of Independent Business. This organization performed a very useful service lately when it conducted a survey about job loss resulting from the minimum wage extension. Only after we have necessary data such as that contained in this worthwhile study, can we in Congress formulate laws which will benefit both our workers and our industry.

Gentlemen, all of this week, the United States Senate has been considering and debating the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. This legislation is vitally important to each of us—not only because large sums of money are involved, but because the issues involved are crucial to our well-being and to the well-being of the nation.

Last Monday I made a major speech on the floor of the Senate outlining my views on the Act itself and the War on Poverty in gen-

eral. Today I would like to speak to you briefly about one aspect of the War on Poverty and present a challenge to you which I hope you and other members of the Chamber of Commerce across the United States will meet.

In 1964 Congress enacted the Administration's Economic Opportunity Act—touted as the ultimate effort in the battle against poverty. All of us—to varying degrees had hopes that a mammoth governmental effort in this sphere of activity would result in the rapid reduction of the evils and ills of poverty in both rural and urban areas of the country.

Our naive and complacency were shattered less than a year later when Watts erupted in violence. The conflagration has spread to other cities—Chicago, Minneapolis, Newark, Plainfield, New Haven, Detroit and yes—even your own great city of Omaha. Obviously, in the cities we have failed. And it appears as though the poverty war has not made much headway in the rural sections of our country either. Sargent Shriver indicated in a March 11 letter that OEO had spent only 30% of its funds in rural areas and admitted that, "we have not been able to get enough programs active in the rural areas." Obviously, we cannot declare "victory" in our war on poverty. We seem to have reached a stalemate.

The increasing frequency of violence and civil disorder is indicative of the fact that discontent and frustration and resentment are rising among the poor, and that our previous efforts at alleviation of their anguish have failed.

Thus far the only answer to the riots has been an application of force. Force has been necessary since in all cases it was imperative that law and order be restored immediately. However, force cannot speak to the underlying causes of riots. Until we understand these causes and relieve them, force in and of itself can only serve to buy us time.

What are these causes?

Your own Mayor, A. W. Sorensen, who I was pleased to note, was cited by Vice President Humphrey as one of the five mayors in the United States who had done the best job this past summer to head off riots, spoke to this issue last summer.

In August of 1966 he was one of the distinguished leaders of city government who came before Senator Ribicoff's Subcommittee to discuss the crisis in our cities. He came only a month after the July 4 riots in Omaha, during the course of which he was forced to appeal to the Governor to bring out the National Guard to preserve law and order.

With this fresh in his mind, Mayor Sorensen gave the Subcommittee a penetrating analysis of the underlying causes of poverty and unrest. As he saw them, those causes were—overcrowded and substandard housing in the ghetto—the lack of adequate recreational facilities for Negro teenagers—inadequate education opportunities for slum children—inequality of opportunity in choosing a home—poor relations with the police and last, and perhaps most crucial, inadequate job training and jobs.

Those of us who sit on the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty saw nothing new or startling in this list. What was startling was Mayor Sorensen's repeated and emphatic assertion that the causes of the rioting have not been diminished although the Federal Government has initiated program after program to solve the underlying problems of poverty.

"The Negro in Omaha," Mayor Sorensen testified, "wants first class citizenship now instead of a lot of headline promises from government . . . The Federal government is constantly making statements and reports . . . about the millions upon millions of dollars which are available to relieve every social evil that we have . . . The sad fact of